

R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Tang et al. '321 (hereinafter Tang) is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Tang is directed to simultaneous wired and wireless remote in-system programming of multiple remote systems (Title).

In contrast, the presently claimed invention (claim 1) provides a wireless transceiver coupled to a programmable logic circuit, where the programmable logic circuit comprises a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package. Claims 15 and 18 include similar recitations. Tang does not disclose or suggest a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package, as presently claimed. Therefore, Tang does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention, arranged as in the present claims.

Specifically, assuming, *arguendo*, the elements 404, 405, 605, 607 and 608 in FIG. 6 of Tang are similar to the presently

claimed programmable logic device, processor and memory circuit (as suggested on page 3, lines 1-3 of the Office Action and for which Applicant's representative does not necessarily agree), Tang does not disclose or suggest a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit **in a single integrated circuit package**, as presently claimed. In particular, Tang appears silent regarding the system 600 of FIG. 6 being in a single integrated circuit package as presently claimed. Furthermore, FIG. 6 of Tang shows two ISP devices 404 and 405 which are (i) labeled with discrete part numbers (i.e., ispLSI® 1048E and ispLSI® 3256E, respectively) and (ii) would be recognized by a person of ordinary skill in the art as discrete parts. Evidence that the ISP devices 404 and 405 would be recognized as discrete components is provided in the form of data sheets for each of the devices 404 and 405 (attached as Exhibits A and B).

Furthermore, Tang states:

Further, as shown in FIG. 6, ISP system 600 may contain **multiple ISP controllers** each assigned an address in the shared common address space. An address in the ISP system 600 is decoded by a **chip-select decoder 609** to provide a **chip select control signal** for selecting one of the ISP controllers (column 4, lines 44-49 of Tang, emphasis added).

Tang provides that:

ISP controller 800 [in FIG. 8 of Tang] can implement ISP controller 402 (see column 3, lines 64-65 of Tang).

Tang further provides that:

ISP controller 800 can be provided as an integrated circuit (column 3, line 66 of Tang).

Since (a) Tang is silent regarding the element 600 being a single integrated circuit package, (b) the ISP device 404 and 405 of Tang are labeled as, and would be recognized as, separate integrated circuits (as evidenced by Exhibits A and B) and (c) the system 600 of Tang can contain **multiple controllers 402** each of which (i) can be provided as an integrated circuit (column 3, line 66 of Tang) and (ii) is selected by a chip select control signal (column 4, lines 44-49 of Tang), it follows that one skilled in the art would not consider FIG. 6 of Tang as disclosing or suggesting a single integrated circuit package, as presently claimed. Thus, Tang does not disclose or suggest a wireless transceiver coupled to a programmable logic circuit, where the programmable logic circuit comprises a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package, as presently claimed. Therefore, Tang does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention, arranged as in the present claims. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14, 16-17 and 19-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15 and 18 which are believed to be allowable. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully

patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang in view of Deming et al. '486 (hereinafter Deming) is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tang in view of Esnouf '108 (hereinafter Esnouf) is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Deming does not cure the deficiencies of Tang. Deming is directed to a method and apparatus for in system programming of a programmable logic device using a two wire interface (Title of Deming). The Office has previously admitted that Deming fails to teach or suggest a programmable logic circuit where the programmable logic circuit comprises a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package (see page 2, paragraph no. 5, last five lines of the Office Action dated November 22, 2002). Therefore, the combination of Tang and Deming does not teach or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over Tang and Deming (see MPEP §2142) and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Esnouf does not cure the deficiencies of Tang. Esnouf is directed to a game apparatus. Esnouf appears silent regarding a programmable logic device, a processor and a memory circuit in a single integrated circuit package, as presently claimed. As such, Esnouf does not and cannot cure the deficiencies of Tang. Therefore, neither Tang nor Esnouf, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14, 16-17 and 19-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 15 and 18 which are believed to be allowable. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicant's representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office
Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.


Robert M. Miller
Robert M. Miller
Registration No. 42,892
24025 Greater Mack, Suite 200
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080
(586) 498-0670

Dated: December 2, 2003

Docket No.: 0325.00372